

Appl. No. 10/787,302

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 16 2007

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**Claim Amendments**

Claims 1, 13, 20 and 25 have been amended in a minor clerical manner.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

The Examiner rejects claims 1-2, 13-14, 20-21 and 23-26 under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by European Patent No. 1 330 138 ("Valentine"). In response, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection for reasons detailed below.

Claim 1

On page 2 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner states that "One subset of point-to-multipoint communications in trunked PMR communication systems is group calls, whereby specific groups of users (read on user device specific set) (col. 2 lines 5-13) within the system are allocated a talk-group identification (TGID) code. Therefore, the teaching of the prior art references still read on." Therefore, the Examiner appears to be of the view that specific groups of users within the system being allocated a talk-group identification code reads on a user device adapted to "obtain from the dispatch network a user-device specific set of at least one provisioned talk-group identifier having a respective provisioned talk-group identifier for each talk-group provisioned for the user device" (emphasis added) as recited in claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner for reasons details below.

Applicant appreciates that Valentine teaches in column 2, lines 5-13 that "One subset of point-to-multipoint communications in trunked PMR communication systems is group calls, whereby specific groups of users within the system are allocated a talk-group identification (TGID) code." (Emphasis added) However, this portion is vague at best as to how a "specific" group of users is allocated a talk-group identification code. Applicant submits that inferring this to mean that the talk-group identification code is user-device specific is improper. Valentine later teaches that a "specific" group of users correspond to those users of a given geographical location. In this manner, the talk groups and associated talk group identifier codes are location-specific, and not user-device specific. Further explanation is provided below.

Appl. No. 10/787,302

Valentine teaches in paragraph 0052 that if the registration is successful, then “the serving BTS assigns and/or transmits one or more TGID codes to the MS, related to location specific group calls in its coverage area” (emphasis added). The MS receives the new TGID code(s) and updates its scan list. Paragraph 0052 explicitly teaches that the TGID codes correspond to “location specific” group calls, which implies that the TGID codes are also location specific. Other portions of Valentine make it clear that the TGID codes are location specific. For example, the first step of claim 1 of Valentine recites “assigning (308) dynamically a location specific group identification code to a group of communication units based upon said communication units’ location or cell within the radio communication system (100)” (emphasis added). Therefore, Applicant submits that Valentine teaches that the TGID codes are location specific and relate to location specific group calls.

The present application is concerned with the problem of informing users of talk groups that are provisioned, typically at the time of service activation, but that the user is unaware of or may have forgotten. Applicant notes that there may be a plurality of talk groups provisioned for the user device. A problem that Applicant has recognized is that the user may forget which talkgroups are provisioned for the user device. Accordingly, the user device is operable to “make information pertaining to the provisioned talkgroup identifiers available to a user of the user device” as recited in claim 1. This allows the user to become aware or be reminded of each talk group that has been provisioned for the user device. The Examiner contends that Valentine teaches this subject matter in Figure 3 and column 8, lines 24-31 (i.e. paragraph 0052). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Paragraph 0052 of Valentine teaches that “The MS 112 receives the new TGID code(s) in step 310, and updates its scan list, as shown in step 312.” However, note that Valentine does not teach that the MS is operable to “make information pertaining to the provisioned talkgroup identifiers available to a user of the user device” as recited in claim 1. Rather, Valentine teaches that “If the MS wishes to initiate a location-specific group call, the MS then uses the newly assigned TGID code.” There is no apparent need in Valentine for the user of the MS to be provided with information pertaining to the new TGID code. Rather, the MS simply uses the new TGID code for initiating a location-specific group call.

Appl. No. 10/787,302

In view of the forgoing, Applicant submits that Valentine does teach or suggest a user device "adapted to obtain from the dispatch network a user-device specific set of at least one provisioned talk group identifier talk-group identifier" (emphasis added), nor a user device adapted to "make information pertaining to the provisioned talkgroup identifiers available to a user of the user device" (emphasis added). Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over Valentine.

Claims 13, 20 and 25

Applicant submits that claims 13, 20 and 25 are patentable over Valentine for similar reasons provided above in respect of claim 1.

Claims 2, 14, 21, 23, 24, 26

Applicant submits that dependent claims 2, 14, 21, 23, 24, 26 are patentable over Valentine for at least their dependence upon the independent claims. Furthermore, Applicant submits that these claims recite additional features not found in the disclosure of Valentine. Examples are provided below.

Claim 23 recites that "the request and response are sent using layer 3 messages". The Examiner contends that Valentine teaches this subject matter in column 8, lines 32-45. However, this portion of Valentine teaches that the MS intermittently scans the frequencies identified on the updated scan list, awaiting notification of a particular group call. This portion of Valentine goes on to teach other things, but is silent to teaching a request and response being sent using layer 3 messages.

Claim 26 recites that "the data structure is an enhanced registration accept message". The Examiner contends that Valentine teaches this subject matter in column 4, line 53 through column 5, line 16. Applicant appreciates that this portion of Valentine teaches that "the system, on receiving an attachment request from a MS 112-116, will then either accept or reject the request". However, this does not teach or suggest a data structure being an enhanced registration accept message.

APR-16-2007 14:46 FROM:

6132328440

TO:USPTO

P.11/11

Appl. No. 10/787,302


The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-2, 13-14, 20-21 and 23-26 under 35 USC 102(a).

In view of the foregoing, early favorable consideration of this application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

PADIAKANDLA KRISHNA RAO

By


Allan Brett
Reg. No. 40,476
Tel.: (613) 232-2486

Date: April 16, 2007

RAB:PDB:mcg

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☒ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER: _____**

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.